IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

Criminal Application No. 4595 of 2005
in
Criminal Application No. 593 of 2003

WITH

Criminal Application No. 4596 of 2005
in

Criminal Application No. 594 of 2003

WITH

Criminal Application No. 4597 of 2005
in

Criminal Application No. 595 of 2003

WITH

Criminal Application No. 4598 of 2005
in

Criminal Application No. 596 of 2003

WITH

Criminal Application No. 4599 of 2005
in

Criminal Application No. 597 of 2003

WITH

Criminal Application No. 4600 of 2005
in

Criminal Application No. 598 of 2003

WITH

Criminal Application No. 4601 of 2005
in

Criminal Application No. 599 of 2003

WITH

Criminal Application No. 4602 of 2005
in

Criminal Application No. 600 of 2003

WITH

Criminal Application No. 4603 of 2005
in

Criminal Application No. 601 of 2003

M/s. Gold Cross Research and ors. ... Petitioners

versus

Smt. Archana Agrawal and others. ....Respondents

Mr. A.S. Rao for the petitioners.
Mrs. M.M. Deshmukh, Additional Public Prosecutor, for the State.

CORAM: **V.G. PALSHIKAR, Ag. C.J.,**
DATE: **JULY 26, 2006**.

P.C.

By these applications, the applicants seek review of the order dated 17th June, 2005 passed by me. The order of which review

is sought reads thus:

> "None for the applicants. By this application the applicants seek quashing of the proceedings started before the appropriate criminal Court. Under the Criminal Procedure Code adequate opportunities to defend the applicants are available. It is open for the applicants to point out to the learned trial Judge under Section 254 of Criminal Procedure Code that no case is made out by the prosecution. It is also open if the applicants so desire to question the issuance of process before the Sessions Court. Nothing has been done. There is no case for interference for this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India or under Section 482. Hence applications dismissed."

It will be seen from the above that the matters were dismissed on merits for availing alternate remedy and pursuing adequate opportunities existing under the Criminal Procedure Code. According to the applications for review, all that has been said is that the order sought to be reviewed was passed ex parte. From a perusal of the order it will be seen that no injury of any kind or prejudice is caused to the applicants and, therefore, there is no need to review the order. These applications are accordingly dismissed.